

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	WARE & 8 . 5008	. •			
	AUG 23	Application	No.	Applicant(s)	
	130 mars	10/789,002		SHEALY ET AL.	
Office Action Sun	nmary	Examiner		Art Unit	
		Lorraine Spe	ctor, Ph.D.	1647	
The MAILING DATE of thi Period for Reply	s communication app	ears on the co	over sheet with the	correspondence ad	ldress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY I WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FRO Extensions of time may be available under after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing da If NO period for reply is specified above, th Failure to reply within the set or extended Any reply received by the Office later than earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	OM THE MAILING Do the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 te of this communication. the maximum statutory period value period for reply will, by statute three months after the mailing	ATE OF THIS 36(a). In no event, will apply and will ex , cause the applicat	COMMUNICATIO however, may a reply be to spire SIX (8) MONTHS from tion to become ABANDON	N. imely filed m the mailing date of this of ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status					
1) Responsive to communic	ation(s) filed on	•			
2a) This action is FINAL.	2b)☐ This	action is non	-final.		
3) Since this application is in	condition for allowa	nce except fo	r formal matters, p	rosecution as to th	e merits is
closed in accordance with	the practice under E	Ex parte Quay	<i>le</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 4	453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pend	ing in the application	•		·	
4a) Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdra	wn from cons	ideration.	•	
5) Claim(s) is/are allo	wed.				
6) Claim(s) is/arė reje					
7) Claim(s) is/are obj					
8) Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> are subject	to restriction and/or	election requi	rement.		
Application Papers	•				•
9) The specification is object	ed to by the Examine	er.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on	is/are: a)∏ acc	epted or b)	objected to by the	e Examiner.	
Applicant may not request the			-	, ,	
Replacement drawing sheet	· •	The state of the s	= , ,	•	` '
11) The oath or declaration is	objected to by the E	xaminer. Note	the attached Office	ce Action or form P	TO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐	-	n priority unde	r 35 U.S.C. § 119((a)-(d) or (f).	•
1. Certified copies of	the priority documen	ts have been	received.	•	
2. Certified copies of	the priority documen	ts have been	received in Applica	ation No	
	ied copies of the pric	•		ved in this Nationa	I Stage
, ,	e International Burea	•	` ''		
* See the attached detailed (Office action for a list	of the certifie	d copies not receive	ved ,	
Attachment(s)	,				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892	?)	. 4) Interview Summa	ry (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw	ing Review (PTO-948)		Paper No(s)/Mail	Date	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (Paper No(s)/Mail Date	P1O-1449 or PTO/SB/08	_) Notice of Informal) Other:	i Hateiri Application (P1	U-132)
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)	Office A	ction Summary		Part of Paper No./Mail I	Date 20060720

Art Unit: 1647

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-13 and 22, drawn to administration of an Ig derived protein to treat an asthma-related condition, classified in class 424, subclass 139.1.
- II. Claims 14-21, drawn to pharmaceutical compositions comprising Ig-derived proteins, classified in class 530, subclass 397.9, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the composition may be used to treat non-asthma related conditions.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

In addition, three election of species requirements are made:

A) Regardless of which invention applicant elects:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: The 16 distinct fragments of SEQ ID NO: 1, as recited in claims 1 and 14. The species are independent or distinct because anti-IL-13 antibodies do not constitute an advance over the prior art, as evidenced by U.S. Patent Nos. 6,884,603, 6,746,839 and 6,664,227 for example. Thus, each individual fragment must be searched separately. Further, the fragments do not comprise a common structure.

Art Unit: 1647

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic. It is noted that the muteins recited in claim 22 will be examined as they correspond to an elected fragment; for instance, if the fragment of SEQ ID NO: 1 residues 40-50 is elected, the Examiner will also consider Ile48 and Val48 substitutions therein.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

B) If applicant elects Invention I, a further election of species is required:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: There are 58 different species of drug recited in claim 13. It is noted that "interleukin antagonists such as IL-4, IL-5, IL-12 antibodies, receptor proteins or antagonists, and antagonist fusion proteins" is considered to be three species, as drawn to IL-4, IL-5 and IL-12, respectively. The species are independent or distinct because each drug requires a separate search of the prior art, as each is physically and functionally distinct from the others.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-3, 5-12 and 22 are generic with respect to this requirement.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. Applicant is further required to specifically point out which of the species of claim 4 include(s) the elected species. An argument that a

Art Unit: 1647

claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

C) If applicant elects Invention I, another further election of species is required:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: Each of the conditions as follows comprises a separate species of medical condition: asthma, bronchial inflammation, excess bronchial mucus or plugs, lung tissue damage, eosinophils accumulation, bronchospasm, narrowing of airways, airway hypersensitivity, airway remodeling, inspatory or expiatory wheezing, breathlessness, chest tightness, coughing, dyspnea, burning, airway edema, tachypnea, tachycardia, cyanosis, allergic rhinitis, infection, atopic dermatitis, biorhythm abnormalities, Churg-Strauus syndrome, and gastroesophageal reflux disease. The species are independent or distinct because each condition may have different causes and effects including different patterns of cytokine involvement, and requires a separate search of the art.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-4, 6-12 and 22 are generic to this requirement.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Art Unit: 1647

Advisory Information

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that in order to be fully responsive, the response to this requirement must include an election of Invention I or Invention II, a species in response to requirement A above, and if Invention I is elected, a species in response to requirements B and C, above. Further, applicant must clearly identify all claims corresponding to the elected species'.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

Art Unit: 1647

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Lorraine M. Spector. Dr. Spector can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 9:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. at telephone number 571-272-0893.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, please contact the Examiner's supervisor, Ms. Brenda Brumback, at telephone number 571-272-0961.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). NOTE: If Applicant does submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to 571-273-8300. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to 571-273-0893.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lorraine Spector, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner

*	OTPE	4011 W
Notice of Reference	es Cited	A STANDARD

2 :				
7	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent Under		
′	10/789,002	Reexamination SHEALY ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Lorraine Spector, Ph.D.	1647	Page 1 of 1	

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	. Name	Classification
*	Α	US-6,746,839	06-2004	Duff et al.	435/6
*	В	US-6,664,227	12-2003	Wynn et al.	514/8
*	С	US-6,884,603	04-2005	Debinski et al.	435/69.52
	D	US-	1		
	Ε	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	н	US-			
	1	US-		·	•
	J	US-			
	к	US-			
	L	US-			
	М	US-	·		

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	0					
	Р			- ; -		
	Q					
	R				·	
	s		·			
	Т	,				

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)					
	U						
	٧						
	w						
	x						

*A copy of this reference is not being turnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).) Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.